YALE SUPPLEMENT

The Intercollegiate Socialist

War and the Socialists

By J. RAMSAY MacDONALD, M.P.

How to Attain Permanent Peace

By LUCIA AMES MEAD

A Reply to Prof. Emery

By JESSIE W. HUGHAN, Ph.D.

Other Articles by

Nina Bull, George L. Arner, Ph.D., Felix Grendon, Ph.D., Henry T. Rogers, Jr., Du Bose Murphy, C. R. Walker, Jr., Thomas M. Duncan

December-January, 1914-15 Ten Cents

The Intercollegiate Socialist

Harry W. Laidler, Editor

Published bi-monthly, except June, July, August and September

Entered as second class matter June 20, 1913, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

41 Union Square W., New York City

10c. a copy — Subscription, 25c. a year

I. S. S. AFFILIATIONS

Adelphi
Alberta (Can.)
American International
Amherst
Barnard
Brown
California
Chicago
Cincinnati
City College (N. Y.)
Clark
Colgate
Colorado
Columbia
Conn. Agricultural
Cooper Union
Cornell
Denison
Florida
George Washington
Hamilton
Hamline
Harvard
Hiram
Illinois
Indiana
John Marshall Law
Mass. Agricultural
Mass. Inst. Technology
Meadville Theological
Miami
Michigan
Montana
N. Y. Dental Colleges
New York
No. Carolina
Ohio Northern
Ohio State
Ohio Wesleyan
Oregon Agricultural
Penn. State
Princeton
Radcliffe
Simmons
So. California Law
Springfield, Y. M. C. A. Coll.
Union Theological
Valparaiso
Washington (Wash.)
Washington-Jefferson
Wesleyan
Western Reserve
Williams
Wisconsin
Yale

The object of the INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY, established September 1905, is "to promote an intelligent interest in Socialism among college men and women." All present or former students of colleges interested in Socialism are eligible to active membership in the Society. Non-collegians are eligible to auxiliary membership. The annual dues of the Society are $2, $5 (contributing membership), $25 or more (sustaining membership.) The dues of student members-at-large are $1 a year. Undergraduate Chapters are required to pay 25c. a year per member to the General Society. All members are entitled to receive The Intercollegiate Socialist. Friends may assist in the work of the Society by becoming dues-paying members, by sending contributions, by aiding in the organization and the strengthening of undergraduate and graduate Chapters, by obtaining subscriptions for The Intercollegiate Socialist, by patronizing advertisers, and in various other ways. The Society's Bi-monthly is 25c. a year, 10c. a copy, 15 copies for $1.

OFFICERS INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

President
J. G. PHELPS STOKES, Yale

1st Vice-President
Mrs. FLORENCE KELLEY, Cornell

2nd Vice-President
ERNEST POOLE, Princeton

Treasurer
MORRIS HILLQUIT, New York (Law School)

Secretary
LEROY SCOTT, Indiana

Organizing Secretary
HARRY W. LAIDLER, Wesleyan

Executive Secretary
Mrs. ALICE K. BOEHME

Executive Committee

Miss JESSIE W. HUGHAN, Barnard
NICHOLAS KELLEY, Harvard
PAUL KENNADAY, Yale
HARRY W. LAIDLER, Wesleyan
Miss CARO LLOYD, Vassar
Miss JULIET S. POYNTZ, Barnard
Mrs. M. B. RAMBAUT, Radcliffe
Dr. I. M. RUBINOW, Columbia
Miss Mary R. SANFORD, Vassar
Prof. VIDA D. SCUDDER, Smith
H. D. SEDGWICK, Harvard
UPTON SINCLAIR, C. C. N. Y.
Miss HELEN PHELPS STOKES
WM. ENGLISH WALLING, Chicago
BOUCK WHITE, Harvard

Alumni Chapters

Boston
Buffalo
Chicago
Cleveland
Fresno
Los Angeles
New York
Philadelphia
Springfield
Staten Island
St. Louis
Washington
Wilkes-Barre

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST

VOL. III. DECEMBER-JANUARY, 1914-15 NO. 2

Sixth Annual Convention I. S. S.

"How Can Permanent Peace Be Assured?" This subject will be grappled with by some of the ablest thinkers in America, including Charlotte Perkins Gilman, editor of *The Forerunner;* Hamilton Holt, editor of *The Independent;* Morris Hillquit, Prof. Ellen Hayes, and Florence Kelley, chairman, at the Sixth Annual Convention Dinner of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, on Wednesday evening, December 30th, at 6:30 P. M., at Tuxedo Hall, 59th Street and Madison Ave., New York City. This session alone—with the discussion of one of the world's most vital problems—will make a visit to the annual convention doubly worth while.

The convention proper will be opened Tuesday afternoon, December 29th, at 2:30, at Miss Stokes' Studio, 90 Grove Street. At this session delegates from the graduate and undergraduate Chapters will give short reports, followed by the discussion of Chapter problems. The reception to the delegates will be given by the New York Alumni Chapter at the headquarters of the Equal Franchise Society, 8 E. 37th St., on Tuesday evening, at 8:15. Here various members of the Executive Committee will say a few words on important phases of the Socialist movement.

The Wednesday morning session will be devoted to the discussion of Chapter problems at Miss Stokes' Studio, and the Wednesday afternoon session, to the Question Box on Socialism at the Rand School of Social Science, 140 E. 19th St. Algernon Lee, Dr. William E. Bohn and others will answer at this time any questions that may then be asked on various phases of Socialism and the Socialist philosophy. The problems of the Alumni Chapters will be discussed on Thursday morning, December 31st, at Miss Stokes' Studio.

All desiring to attend the Convention Dinner are requested to send in their order for tickets at once. The price of the tickets is $1 each. All applications must be received by the afternoon of December 29th. Every undergraduate and alumni member who can possibly do so is urged to be present.

A rare opportunity is here given to meet the leaders of Socialist thought. Help us to make this the Red Letter Convention of the Society.

Justice First

> "If you can afford to do so much for your poor, you must have robbed them pretty thoroughly first."—TOLSTOI.
>
> "Men will be unwisely fond, vainly faithful, unless primarily they are just; and the mistake of the best men through generation after generation has been that great one of thinking to help the poor by alms-giving and by preaching of patience and hope, and by every other means, emollient and consolatory, except the one thing God orders for them—Justice."—RUSKIN.

These suggestive quotations appear at the beginning of a remarkable letter printed by Nina Bull and sent in reply to those charities engaged in dealing with effects, while refusing to pry into fundamental causes. In these days, when so many thousands of sentimentalists are being swept off of their feet by piteous appeals for aid, the letter of Mrs. Bull's, vividly portraying, as it does, the ineffectiveness of so much of our charitable work, and indicating the growing recognition of such ineffectiveness, is most refreshing. The letter reads as follows:

"I am trying to do what I can to relieve those who are suffering or without opportunity—but long experience and observation have convinced me that benevolent donations can do little more than relieve a few scattered cases of distress. While one family or individual is being raised from degradation by

the strenuous efforts of the charitably inclined, another family or individual—next door perhaps—is plunged from self-respect into degradation by economic pressure. And so it goes.

"As Henry Ford has put it: 'If a railroad had a piece of track that wrecked cars every day and piled them in the ditch, it would be foolish to spend much time or money on building fine repair shops for putting the wreckage in shape again. The track itself should be fixed first. Charity and philanthropy are repair shops, and their efficiency, however high, does not remove the cause of human wrecks.'

"I have lost patience with the constant effort to deal with effects while ignoring their obvious causes, and further than this, the current stress on philanthropy seems to me to have a positively harmful effect in diverting the attention and energy of the community from more fundamental issues. What the poor need is not charity and not even education primarily, but a *change in social conditions that will make charity unnecessary and true education possible.* We are all of us responsible for the system that hands over the good things of the earth to a few.

"Therefore I cannot any longer give money or personal service to institutions or movements which aim at less than the abolition of poverty itself. If this appears to you unreasonable, consider for a moment the case of the sanitarium for poor consumptives—one of the most meritorious of all benevolent works. Suppose the managers of such an institution should get all the money they ask for—all they can use. What is the result? At best they will reach but a small percentage of the sufferers, and of that percentage they only claim to cure a tithe. Meanwhile, as fast as they are ever likely to patch up the victims that come under their care, the inexorable operation of our economic system is making its new victims daily. We cannot help seeing, when we look, that the unhealthy conditions under which the poor must live and work, inevitably breed more consumption and more poverty. In old-time asylums for the insane the test for insanity was to see whether the patient had sense to stop the water from running into the tub by turning it off at the faucet, before attempting to empty the tub by baling out the water. How much of our modern philanthropy could meet that test?

"You may ask: 'What of the present suffering? Must we not care for those who need help now—the victims of past wrongs—and keep on doing this until, working along other lines perhaps, we have removed the causes?' My answer is that each must serve the highest good perceived. As a matter of simple morality, such work must be left to those who believe in it more than I do. Although it frequently happens that I cannot resist individual appeals to my sympathy, nevertheless because I see tragic futility in this endless philanthropic patching, because I believe I have found a constructive program that probes deeper and reaches farther, it would be wrong for me to join in organized efforts of this sort, especially in view of the fact that for the larger and more difficult task there are always far fewer servants than for the easier, nearer and more obviously appealing. As I see it, justice to the poor is demanded of us ahead of charity.

"And so, though I sympathize with you as with all who are trying to serve humanity, I must refuse your appeal."

Copies of the letter may be obtained in quantities from the I. S. S. Office.

The Magazine

We are pleased to present in this issue important contributions on the war by the leader of the British Socialist forces, and by one of the most active members of the World Peace Foundation. It is also a pleasure to publish a number of short contributions from members of the flourishing Yale Chapter. The February-March issue will devote some space to the Columbia University group, and will also probably include an important article by J. Keir Hardie on "What Should Be Done to Bring About a Lasting Peace." This article from one of the foremost anti-militarists of the world, bids fair to be of unusual interest and importance.

The Intercollegiate Socialist has already won a recognized place in the educational world. To fulfill its mission, however, it must have your ardent support. If you believe in its work, we ask you to obtain subscribers, to purchase bundles for sale and distribution, constantly to keep your friend reminded of the fact that *The Intercollegiate Socialist is the magazine which he cannot afford to miss.*

War and the Socialists

By J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P.
Formerly Chairman of the British Labor Party

The activities of the European Socialist and Labor groups, before the war, were directed to building up an international Socialist understanding so close and intimate that it would in the end have prevented diplomatists and military castes from bringing war upon Europe. We knew quite well that such an organization would be useless unless it reached a point of efficiency which was still far off when this war broke out. It is so easy for diplomatists to commit countries in such a way that their very existence is jeopardized and then turn to the citizens and say: "Unless you fight, the enemy will batter down your gates and reduce you to a state of subjection." In such circumstances peace organizations are shattered and the desire for peace becomes little more than academic. That is actually what has happened. Twenty-four hours before soldiers began to march, the peoples of Europe were at peace and harbored no hostile feelings against each other. Twenty-four hours after the soldiers marched the peoples were enemies. Looking back at events the position that some of us have taken up regarding Socialist method, both national and international, is fully vindicated. The German Social Democrats kept themselves far too much aloof from other German movements making in their direction and were thus never able to use their enormous backing in the country to destroy Prussian conservatism and its military organization. They were too much concerned in far-off events to pay that attention to the immediate political situation which was necessary. Had they done the latter they could have overthrown Prussianism in Prussia and with that would have gone Prussianism in the rest of Germany. Our French comrades, on the other hand, acquiesced too readily in the Russian alliance which was being exploited by the ordinary political parties for ends that were purely militarist and Chauvinist. They talked in a vague way of ending war by international strikes and omitted to attack the political circumstances which made any thought of such a strike an utter impossibility. When the war broke out, they were supplied with the excuse for entering upon it that their country was invaded and they were compelled to join hands with everybody else in repelling the invader. We, ourselves, in Great Britain have, I believe, the best record of all. Whilst we were working for peace in a general way, we declined to support in any particular the policy and proposals of those making war. Our feebleness consisted in the fact that Great Britain was asleep in foreign matters. Our insular position has had the effect of cutting us off from Continental affairs. Our people are indifferent to Foreign Office transactions and are perfectly content to allow their foreign relationships to be discussed and settled in secret by men who are not called upon to explain what they are doing and what they have in mind. The result has been that we never have been able to get up popular interest in foreign policy, and when the war broke out the minds of our people were quite unprepared to consider why we were involved, or what the issues of the war were to be. Our newspapers published columns of the most absurd stuff about German culture and German de-

signs. The bookstalls became burdened with treatises on Germany, which were greedily devoured by ignorant readers and all sorts of side issues were dragged in as though they were important. The intention of the country, however, is quite clear. We have been roused by the German invasion of Belgium and all our old enthusiasm for small states and for the inviolability of treaty obligations has been awakened. In this respect the difference between the conditions of the South African War and the present is enormous. Everyone feels that there is nothing sordid or Chauvinist about our intentions. It is a war for liberty and democracy so far as the man in the street is concerned.

Those of us who decline to be swept off our feet, even whilst we pay homage to our national enthusiasm, cannot help welcoming this temper and will do everything we can to make it effective when peace comes. Our work at the present moment is to strengthen it and to prevent it from being swamped by the deterioration in thought and purpose which always comes from a protracted war. The leading newspapers are doing their best to bring about the deterioration by wild and bitter campaigns, stirring up prejudice and hatred. If they succeed, the result will be that every good sentiment which has made our people flock to the colors will be betrayed and laughed at when the war is over. They have not done much damage yet and one welcomes the stand made by some other influential newspapers for calmness and rationality.

So far as Socialists are concerned, they must continue their efforts to keep the foundations of the International intact so that at the earliest possible moment they may begin to rebuild upon these foundations what the war has destroyed. Above all, they must coöperate to put an end to secret diplomacy and to the handing over of foreign policy to a small handful of men drawn from the aristocratic and plutocratic classes. The one danger which this war has revealed is not that of militarism, because that is secondary, but that of class diplomacy, for upon that all militarism, both German and British, rests. On this point I differ from some of my Socialist colleagues who regard wars as being inevitable under our present industrial order. Of course trade rivalry has much to do with war. The opposition of counting-houses steals a way into the national mind. Trade rivalry becomes national jealousy and ill-will, but that of itself would not result in war; it only does so when international relationships are conducted by a political order which emphasizes the jealousies of the industrial order and translates them into military opposition. That is what the Socialist movements of Europe will have to strike at when this war is over. If they succeed, this will be the last of our wars; if they fail this will be but the first of a series of conflicts.

I am very glad that the American Socialist movement is vigilant for peace. There can be no doubt whatever but that there is far more promise in the victory of the Allies than in that of Germany, even although Russia is fighting with us, and I hope that American opinion will not be swayed from that point of view by anything that is to happen. If the war lasts, many difficulties, particularly commercial ones, may have to be faced by American and British statesmen, but if these difficulties were to lead to any hostile feeling between the two countries the calamity would be unspeakable, not merely so far as you and we are concerned, but in the interests of the whole world. Knowing the attitude I have taken up on the war itself my American friends, I hope, will believe that this appeal of mine to them is made in the conviction that if the

good-will between us were to be destroyed or if they suspected the good motives of my country, the interests that would benefit and the causes that would triumph would be just those which your country and mine most detest because they are least in accordance with our best traditions.*

* The above article was sent to the Editor in the form of a letter. Mr. Macdonald stated that the pressure upon his time was such that it would be impossible for him to write a formal article. Permission, however, was granted to publish abstracts from this letter. Mr. Macdonald, at the outbreak of the war, resigned from leadership of the Labor Party on account of his pacifist principles and has since conducted a vigorous anti-militarist propaganda in Great Britain. He is one of the leading spirits of the Union of Democratic Control now formulating a series of proposals which might form the basis of a permanent peace.

How to Attain Permanent Peace

By Lucia Ames Mead

That the world will never have peace until it is organized was the great insight of Immanuel Kant, the profoundest thinker of modern times. He foresaw that safe organization could come only when the nations had representative government. The Voice of the People speaking through representative government must precede not only Socialism, but all political progress.

The present war—the greatest calamity in human history—has been precipitated because, despite enormous development *within* nations, there was no adequate organization *between* nations and no representative government in Europe that had not allowed itself to become so muzzled and bound hand and foot as to be helpless when time was the prime necessity. The war, thank God, came not because mankind had grown bloodthirsty. No nation wanted war. It is due to alliances, bred of fear, and to huge armaments, the fruit of suspicion. It is due to the sophistry of the army and navy experts who joined with the war traders—in forcing scared tax-payers to fill the world with instruments of terror. It is due to economic illusions, *e. g.,* that trade follows the flag; to false analogies, *e. g.,* between navies and police; to false premises, *e. g.,* that government is based on force; to false reasoning, *e. g.,* that the survival of the fittest means the survival of the best and strongest; to false prophecies, *e. g.,* that "only great armaments will assure peace." The philosophy of Bernhardi is the philosophy of Lord Roberts and of militarists in Paris, Petrograd, and Washington. Its basic ideas contain nothing new, though its hideous superstructure amazes us.

The first step toward world peace is to secure it in the eight nations which own nine-tenths of the world's armaments. Six of these nations are now at war. Italy has just ended a war and the United States just avoided war. When the eight nations form a League of Peace, the other forty nations who own one-tenth of the world's armament, will give no trouble. It is only the so-called great Christian nations that menace civilization at present. But Asia is watching and, if the war system is renewed after the present conflict, it means that Asia, as fast as she gains wealth, will turn it into armaments and that a European-Asiatic war, born of dread, may wipe out all that makes life worth the living. The future of mankind hangs on the question whether the world learns the real lesson of this war—the futility of armaments to insure peace, and the necessity of coöperation instead of rivalry between nations.

How shall most of these eight strong nations ever transform a Balance of Power into a Concert of Powers and dwindle huge, rival armies and navies into an International Police which are the prerequisites of permanent peace? Certainly not by the dictum of my friend, Keir Hardie, whose noble protest against impending war I listened to with deep emotion at the Brussels Congress last July. He declared that only through Socialism could peace between nations be attained. In like manner, many a good man asserts that not until all men love each other as brothers will war cease.

Both of these claim too much. They relegate to a future too far distant, the necessary prerequisite for either a widespread Socialism or true Christianity. Men must cease preparation for organized slaughter as part of their political system, must abolish rival armies and navies a thousand years before the millennium and hundreds of years perhaps before men love all races as their brothers. Justice is possible even when love is weak. Peace is the child of Justice. But peace between nations is not primarily dependent on just industrial conditions within a nation.

The Seven Issues of the Liberal Socialist League each and all concern purely national questions. No education is needed to persuade the common man to approve his government's securing permanent peace between itself and other nations. He would always rejoice at peace if he thought that it could be easily and honorably obtained. The farmer and artisan never crave for war *per se,* however madly they will fight when war has once begun. But the education required to secure everywhere the common man's consent to the full Socialist program or to convert him to a genuine love of mankind is great and incalculable. If we assume that decent human relations cannot exist, that the world must remain in constant jeopardy of recurring cataclysms like that which is now wiping out civilization, until the highest sense of industrial justice and Christianity is reached, then indeed may all who are now living lose their courage.

This notion is a monstrous fallacy. When this war is over, a few agreements may be made which in a generation will transform the world without industrial revolution or miraculous change of human nature. Whether those agreements are made will depend largely upon whether Americans rise now to their golden opportunity, call a halt in their own increase of armaments, educate public sentiment and stand as a unit for abolition of the war system so that we may lead the nations to that world organization which can alone secure a permanent peace.

TREATIES FOR DELAY.

The first agreement that might well be urged when this war ends will be for treaties binding the nations to delay hostilities for a year, pending an international commission's investigation of all facts regarding a dispute. As in the Dogger Bank affair, when war threatened between England and Russia, such investigation resulted in hot blood cooling off and in much less than a year Russia's offering to pay over three hundred thousand dollars damages for her blunder on the North Sea. The United States has just signed over twenty-five such treaties and when they are also signed with Germany and Japan, as they probably will be later, her excuse for armaments will largely be curtailed. These are treaties that, unlike those affecting conduct after war is begun, are the kind most likely to be kept. It will be for each nation's interest to keep them; and, whether for a nation's interest or not, treaties have been kept about the same as business contracts.

AN ARMAMENT "HOLIDAY."

A second agreement, pending ultimate measures, should be a halt in armaments. Let the eight nations agree for eight or

ten years to add no gun, nor ship, nor fort to their equipment. This will give time for conference and sane readjustment. Then let them begin at the third Hague Conference, to be called as soon as may be after the war closes, and prepare definitely for World Organization.

The one nation of all others which can show forty-eight nations how to organize is that which for one hundred and twenty-five years has kept peace between its federated states. The forty-eight United States of our Republic, despite the number of homicides and lynchings within their states, far surpassing that in any of the other Powers, have kept the peace around their border lines. Again and again interstate quarrels have occurred which were more serious than many which have led to European wars; yet, because Washington, Franklin, Madison and their compeers, sitting in Independence Hall in 1787, prearranged that such disputes were to be settled by a Supreme Court, no war has ever come between one state and another. The effort of one-half the states in 1861 to overthrow the national government did not affect the fact that the Court did all that it was designed to do. Following the analogy if after all the nations had federated and had free trade, one-half of them should try to overthrow the whole system no Hague Court could suppress them, but such a situation is hardly conceivable.

WORLD ORGANIZATION will involve a loose federation of the nations with a Supreme Court to which all who federate will pledge themselves to submit all purely international disputes not otherwise peacefully settled. Practical peace can be attained when the dozen strongest nations pledge themselves; the others will soon follow.

NON-INTERCOURSE.

Such pledge involves as a corollary gradual disarmament and the substitution for armies and navies of an International Police, composed of a quota from each armed power, to be used like city police, mainly for friendly, protective functions when earthquake, famine or other disaster occurs. As Justice Brewer well said, we should never need an army to force any recalcitrant nation to court. The new compulsion should be what Justice Brewer himself urged—non-intercourse. Let an agreement for it be embodied in international law and it be everywhere recognized as the declared penalty for break of faith. Let every nation know that, if it breaks its pledge, it shall at once become anathema, excommunicate, with every postal, railroad, shipping, and telegraph connection severed and it will probably never invoke such drastic punishment. This force, unlike a navy, would cost nothing for its up-keep when not employed.

FREE TRADE.

This will be a natural and probably necessary consequent of world organization, but it could hardly precede it. Professor Giddings' claim that it is necessary for permanent peace is perhaps correct. But the primary consideration is recognition of the vital interdependence of nations, that the sovereignty of nations must be limited in favor of the great interests of the world. Never again must any groups of nations be permitted by entangling alliances to compel four hundred million people into war against their will. Given treaties for delay and an end to private gain in the manufacture of armaments, and these practicable methods of securing peace will follow. The best thought of England is ready for this program. May America with clear vision and high courage join with her and proclaim the death of the War System.

A Reply to Professor Emery*

By Jessie Wallace Hughan, Ph.D.

The Intercollegiate Socialist is to be congratulated upon having secured an economist of Professor Henry C. Emery's standing to set forth the anti-Socialist argument. After the absurdities with which men of supposed liberal education have bombarded Socialism, it is a pleasure to read Professor Emery's clear statement of Marxian doctrine, and his consistent treatment of the future commonwealth as an economic proposition. If more scholars of repute would thus break "the conspiracy of silence," we should have fewer Socialists on the one hand and conservatives on the other wasting their eloquence upon ideas of the last century.

Like other reasonable anti-Socialists, however, Professor Emery seems to have preserved his logic only at the cost of a certain displacement of issues and misunderstanding of ideals. Reversing the order of Professor Emery, I will take up first the second part of his article, which, as the author admits possible objections to the word "utopian," I prefer to term a criticism of the Socialist "ideal."

"The Socialist," he says, "must defend the working of his 'Socialistic state'!" Must he do so—in detail? Could the fathers of our republic have defended effectually the workings of their democratic state? If they had made the attempt, the defense would now be of little value, for we have departed far from their conception of its workings, and recognize that we are still groping toward the ideal democracy. Yet, with all its incompleteness, do we wish their work undone? Granting, as most of us do, the correctness of their ideal in its broad outlines, are we not willing to see the details shape themselves gradually as economic development suggests?

We cannot prove that the Co-operative Commonwealth will run on greased wheels and that political vigilance may go to sleep with its installation. The author is right, however, in asking Socialists to dwell more than they have done on its general outline; for the tendencies of industry and the policies of the proletariat have already foreshadowed much—more perhaps than Washington discerned—of his completed political system.

Professor Emery's definition of Socialism is in error as regards the phrase "and this not on the lines of local communities or industrial unions, but on lines roughly corresponding at first to existing national units." Since Socialists are consistent advocates of decentralization and are strongly influenced by industrial unionism, the assumption is without foundation. A still more serious mistake is the failure to insert in the definition the word "principal" before "means of production," as no modern Socialist authority expects the social ownership of *all* these means. Instead, then, of centralized ownership of all means of production by the nation, we must amend the definition to read social ownership of the principal means of production by the nation, the local community, and the industrial union.

We now take up the three objections of the author.

The first is as follows: Although under Socialism the incentive to labor might be sufficient in the case of the proletariat on the one hand and the captains of industry on the other, it would not be adequate as

* The article on "Some Objections to Socialism," by Prof. Henry C. Emery, of the Department of Political Economy, Yale University, appeared in the April-May issue of *The Intercollegiate Socialist*

regards the middle class. "Members of this class," he says, "toil incessantly from motives which would not exist if accumulation were impossible and moderate comfort was assured."

If Professor Emery had defined this middle class more exactly, the objection would be easier to meet. It is probable that he has in mind, however, the present-day small capitalist, a class which, according to the Socialist view, is rapidly disappearing and therefore negligible. Granting their survival as independent craftsmen or farmers under the Co-operative Commonwealth, they would still keep the same incentive as now, that of an increased product and therefore a larger income. If, as is more probable, most of the present middle class are destined to become salaried workers, their position will then approximate that of our modern professional class. These, it is true, seldom have the incentive of the would-be capitalist, the prospect of some day living upon the labor of others. Yet in our American families of this class, the hereditary doctors, professors, and ministers, do we notice a slackening of labor? Is it not rather to these families, where "moderate comfort is assured" and "accumulation" a rarity, that we confidently look for our disinterested public servants? The author has shown his understanding of the Socialist ideal by avoiding the "equality of income" error. In projecting the small capitalist point of view, however, into a society from which the small capitalist is to be eliminated, he seems to misunderstand the psychology of his own class, that of the professional workers.

The most fatal objection, according to Professor Emery, is that the Socialist state must "directly and arbitrarily" accumulate the capital of the future, but that society is not likely "consciously to provide for the welfare of a distant and impersonal future generation." We venture to say, on the contrary, that society is constantly providing for this welfare, and that on a vast scale. The state activities at present most conspicuous—education, armament, the conservation of natural resources, the Panama canal—do these not look farther into the future than any man looks in providing for his wife and children? For an enterprise that will pay in ten years we trust to the private entrepreneur, but when we wish "consciously to provide for the welfare of a distant and impersonal future generation," we are helpless but for the state. Society is the only logical accumulator, for society lives forever.

The last objection predicts an industrial militarism. "Under Socialism consumption will be arbitrarily adjusted to the facts of production. Every Socialistic scheme to give freedom of choice in the field of industry, or by centralized action to satisfy the great majority with their relative rewards, breaks down utterly."

The word "arbitrarily," frequently used here, is somewhat invidious. What does it mean? If the final sentence carries the idea that some despotic Socialist bureau will selfishly decide to produce only a certain amount of oil or sugar and adjust consumption accordingly, it is wrong. Society the consumer will have complete control over society the producer. If the idea is, however, that under Socialism production and consumption will be *deliberately* adjusted with the aid of public experts and not by the present "business cycle" anarchy, he is doubtless right. And why not?

The second sentence disposes of every Socialistic scheme, without telling what these schemes are. The term "centralized action" is clearly an error after what has been pointed out, and the whole notion of militarism falls with that of centralization. Under the Socialist regime of unequal rewards, moreover, each man receiving the approximate value of his own product, there is as much room for competition in the best sense as at present.

Let us now consider some of Prof. Emery's objections to the more theo-

retical phases of the Socialist philosophy. In making the surplus value theory the core of "scientific Socialism," and economic determinism a mere background, the author disregards the history of Socialism as well as the present platforms of the party. It is upon the Communist Manifesto of 1848, containing no explicit reference to the value theory, that the Socialist movement is founded, and not upon the closet philosophy which appeared in the '60s in "Capital."

The treatment of "scientific" Socialism is further weakened by the ignoring of all post-Marxian modifications. While far ahead of the orthodox economists of his day, Marx undoubtedly shared in their errors, and it is hardly fair to confront the Marxian of fifty years ago with the standard economics of 1914. The labor theory of value is, in the opinion of some Socialists, at least, one of these outgrown doctrines, and Professor Emery's criticism of it is well taken. When he goes on to say, however,—"Interest, on analysis, is seen to be not the result of a peculiar social arrangement, but inherent in the individual's estimate of present and future wealth,"—he fails to hit with exactness the Marxian idea. As profits had not yet been isolated as the share of the entrepreneur, Marx used the loose terms "profits" and "interest" to designate the entire gain of the capitalist employer, and while interest pure and simple cannot be "the result of a peculiar social arrangement," the residuum which we designate employer's profits may properly be identified with the capitalist system of production. On the other hand, in giving as the only source of interest the individual's estimate of present and future wealth, the author seems to have neglected the most vulnerable point of Marxism, its denial of the productivity of capital as a cause of interest.

The most practical part of "Capital" is that dealing with the "standard of life" as determining wages, and, although the author may rightly require modifications in view of other factors, his statement that Marx "neglects the demand side of the equation entirely" is not quite accurate. The whole Socialist analysis of capitalism presupposes a demand for labor that is approximately sated, as evidenced by the permanence of the reserve army of unemployed and casually employed. Marx's neglect of demand is therefore logical, at least as far as unskilled and unorganized labor is concerned, as long as unemployment remains a factor in our economic life.

It is indeed true that some Socialists "assert that these are non-essentials, and that the essence of the doctrine is found in economic determinism (materialistic conception of history) and the theory of the class struggle." The latter are the main bulwarks of Socialist doctrine, as a glance at the platforms will show. Yet it is not our mere acceptance of the economic interpretation of history or of the fact of struggle between classes that makes us "scientific" Socialists. These ideas, as Professors Emery and Seligman have said, we share by this time with many of our opponents. "Scientific Socialism" consists in the application of these doctrines to history by the peculiar method of the Communist Manifesto or Engels' "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," where the fall of capitalism is predicted as the result of its inherent contradiction. This contradiction, whereby one class of persons owns privately the capital which is used socially by another class, is to produce the catastrophe of our present system, in part by the automatic processes of the concentration of capital, the disappearance of the middle class, and the recurrence of crises, in part by the deliberate action of the class struggle, intensified by the increasing misery of the working class.

It is this application which the author has attacked in his "empirical method," by denying the fulfilment of the Socialist predictions. "The verdict to which he refers is doubtless that expressed by

Professor Simkhovitch in his "Marxism vs. Socialism," and, while space forbids me here, as it forbade Professor Emery, to cite details, I simply mention that the statistics which Mr. Simkhovitch brings against the charges of concentration and disappearance of the middle class have been disproved successfully by Dr. Rubinow in his recent book, "Was Marx Wrong?", and to some extent by myself several years ago in "American Socialism of the Present Day."

In acknowledging the business cycle, though not the catastrophic crisis, as inherent in the competitive system, the author makes the chief difference between his own and the Socialist point of view to be a matter of degree, the question whether the crisis will ever completely overthrow capitalism or merely continue to weaken it at intervals. Neither Socialists nor their opponents have settled this question, for the development of industry and the process of concentration itself have introduced complexities that Marx was unable to foretell. Though not vital, the subject is of decided interest, the best Socialist treatment of it perhaps being that of the statistician Lucien Sanial.

It is unlikely that Marx ever meant by "increasing misery" the sinking of the entire proletariat into despair, and modern Socialists have been careful to explain the conditions as one of relative, not absolute deterioration. Furthermore such statements as Professor Emery's that "the misery of the working class does not increase, but is progressively diminished" are invariably supported by statistics of poverty, estimated at nominal or real wages, and not of misery, a compound of many things. In Marx's famous statement of the doctrine he mentions poverty, if at all, only incidentally; and, if the psychological condition of misery lends itself to statistics in any degree, it must consider such matters as unemployment, uncertainty, accident, standard of living, and relative, rather than absolute income. Since it is the revolution-producing character of the misery that is in question, Marx's prophecy requires for its fulfilment not the abjectness of the "slum proletariat," but the effectual discontent of an unsubmerged working class.

While that portion of Prof. Emery's article regarding Socialist theory is thus insufficiently proved, that part, dealing with Socialism in practice, has already been found to be marred throughout by some of the old-fashioned assumptions regarding the Socialist state. We cannot believe that he is unfamiliar with the current platforms or the current Socialist authorities, still less that he has deliberately misunderstood them. Perhaps, with others, he is merely unwilling to take twentieth century Socialism at its word; perhaps he is still seeking for the living among the dead, and, like so many critics of Christianity, is losing touch with a mighty movement for good because he forbids it to reinterpret its Westminster Confession.

The Yale Chapter I. S. S.—Its Accomplishments

By Henry T. Rogers, Jr.,
President Yale Chapter 1913-14.

Yale is not only one of the oldest universities in the country but it is also one of the most conservative. It was in an atmosphere charged with conservatism in a high degree that the Yale Chapter of the I. S. S. was launched in the fall of 1910, and for the first two years of its existence the chapter had a hard uphill fight to secure either recognition from the authorities or tolerance from the students. Now both have been secured in abundance, and

last year found the Chapter with a membership of over fifty, who were able to carry through a successful program of nine or ten meetings addressed by prominent lecturers, among them President Hadley himself.

At Yale there has long been noted a great indifference to the social problems of the outside world. Indifference to these problems naturally results in ignorance concerning them and ignorance just as naturally in conservatism in deciding on the best way to solve them. If the fact is also considered that a large proportion of Yale men come from relatively wealthy families, with a point of view developed in an environment of comparative wealth, it is easy to see that until the advent of the Yale Society for the Study of Socialism the vast majority of the students were not able to obtain a broad outlook on the problems of society. Only one side of the picture was presented to them, only one general social philosophy was brought home to them. This philosophy is based on the proposition that things as they are and always have been are right merely by virtue of their present and past existence. It may be said in passing that many things are done at Yale to-day for no better reason than that they always have been done, and it should occasion no surprise that the same attitude should be displayed towards social phenomena.

The Yale Chapter, having as its avowed purpose the study of such a wildly radical thing as Socialism, naturally gave the university a slight shock when its presence became noticed. Very few men in the university knew much about Socialism (it was only this last year that a course on Socialism was begun in the Economics department), and most of the students fought rather shy at first of becoming identified in any way within the academic walls with such a suspicious movement. However, time has brought tolerance. The Chapter has been able to arouse a considerable interest in Socialism and other movements looking toward a solution of social issues. It has at least forced a large number of students to recognize that social conflicts and problems exist, and that they are demanding solution.

Probably very few men in the university have become Socialists as a result of the Society's activities. But the purpose of the Yale chapter is not to make Socialists. Its purpose is to arouse an intelligent interest in Socialism, and it may safely be said that this purpose has been and will continue to be fulfilled. The important thing is that a great many Yale men have been enabled to see the working class philosophy, to study its various manifestations and to judge these things in an infinitely more intelligent and broad-minded way than formerly. Many men have been started **thinking** about the social difficulties of our day, and, in bringing about that result, the Chapter has certainly taken the first great step toward inspiring the students of this great American university to face and help to solve the pressing social problems of the country.

Rt. Rev. Franklin Spencer Spalding

By Du Bose Murphy, Yale, 1915,
President Yale Society for the Study of Socialism.

On the few occasions when I had the privilege of talking to Bishop Spalding, I was always impressed by his overflowing energy and enthusiasm. He was one of those rare men who are always giving, and yet who seem to have limitless resources within. The depth and strength of his inner life was an

inspiration to all who came in touch with him; and the breadth of his sympathies and the magnetism of his personality won him friends wherever he went.

Although he never joined the Party (he was not much of a "joiner," he said), Bishop Spalding was an ardent Socialist. The stimulus of his sermons in New York last year, at the time of the Convention of the Episcopal Church, will have a lasting influence on the Church everywhere. He was a leader in the rapidly growing army of those who are coming to believe that Socialism needs real Christianity to be truly effective, just as Christianity needs the continual vitalization furnished by those who see the social problem in all its significance.

Socialism and Christianity were never at variance in his mind, for he believed that in their essentials the two must go together. They both involve the belief (idealistic though it may be) that men can work more effectively in unselfish co-operation than in selfish competition. Socialism, to be really effective, needs the spirit of Christ more than it needs anything else, for there has been no power in history equal to Christianity for inspiring a great body of people to community of purpose. And the success of Socialism will depend on that one point: the ability of men to work together for the common good.

It is interesting to think that Bishop Spalding became a Socialist after many years of opposition. He wrote me not long before his death that he had gone through college without knowing what the word Socialism meant. He was always true to his own standard of straight thinking, and once he had become convinced of the soundness of Socialism, there was nothing half-hearted in his support of the movement. May God send us more of his kind to carry on his work.

Note:—Bishop Franklin Spalding was an enthusiastic member of the I. S. S. His untimely death was a great loss to the Episcopal Church of America, to the entire forward-looking movement.

Why A Man Should Know Something About Socialism

By C. R. Walker, Jr., Yale, 1916

The men who have left their mark upon history, who have been called by their successors great, have been the men who have caught and expressed either consciously or unconsciously the spirit of their time. For, only by knowing that spirit, can men hope intelligently either to criticize, alter, or improve conditions. If a man with the desire for this knowledge happens to live in America, he will in all probability make the word "socialism" the name for *one* of the tendencies of the age that he feels he must master. In nine cases out of ten the meaning of the word will be as vague to him as Chinese characters.

This however should serve as a lash, not as a hindrance, to his inquiry. For if the world is talking about something which one cannot define, there is no reason to suppose, therefore, that that something is either non-existent or non-vital. For my part I am interested in the indefinite thing that in our day creeps into institutions, governments, and private action, that has a Socialistic tinge, but is by no means as concrete as a party platform or a candidate for president. It is really these under-

streams that make up the stuff of the age. The party organizations are merely the crust that comes to the surface.

It is the manner of thinking socialistically that is interesting to me. It is because of the existence of this big understream in every man's mind, which is a vital part of the age tendency, that we ought to study *formal Socialism,* that we ought seriously to study the party and its views as being the crystallization of the general popular feeling, even though, as I believe, the crystallization may, in spots, be immature.

It is a curious fact that the very name "Socialism" stands more in the way of healthy knowledge-getting than almost any factor, unless it be laziness. We have identified "Socialism" with so many ugly things, such as mob rule and equal distribution, that we are unwilling to think that "any good thing" can come out of Socialism. And yet we stand more or less for Socialistic legislation, such as the control of monopolies by the central government, without suspecting its origin.

It seems to me imperative for any man who would understand his time to inquire into its tendencies; discover which of these that he has already approved boasts a Socialistic beginning, and then at least to make trial whether more good may not issue from the same source.

Reflections Of A Voter—Which Party Shall I Support?

By Thomas M. Duncan, Yale, 1915,
Secretary Y. S. S. S.

More powerful than ever is the appeal of the Socialist Party to the college voter. It is assumed that the college graduate has a general knowledge of the real problems before the political parties of the day—the extent of the functions of government, the questions of capital and labor, etc. With what party shall he ally himself?

What have the old parties to offer? What is the policy of the Republican Party? Is it exemplified by Wisconsin or Pennsylvania? Minnesota or Connecticut? By La Follette and Cummins or by Penrose and Taft?

What does the Democratic Party stand for? Does Nebraska, Florida or New York represent it? Wilson or Murphy? Bryan or Sullivan? Each party endeavors to be all things to all men. Each has a few respected leaders; each has its state skeletons carefully closeted every four years; each is characterized by red fire, brass bands, flamboyant rhetoric, vague and innocuous platforms and an assortment of "good fellows." The policy of each varies infinitely in city, state and nation with the brief ascendencies of different leaders. Any analysis of social problems is conspicuous by its absence.

Nowhere do these parties fail more miserably than in their opposition to Socialism. At the first success of Socialism they fuse, thus admitting that their campaigns are either sham battles or mere scrambles for office. Take the case of Milwaukee, for instance. W. H. Stafford defeated Victor Berger on the Democratic ticket in 1912. At Washington he voted with Wilson. This year he has been returned on the Republican ticket and is going back to Washington to undo his villainy of the past two years. Suppose he succeeds—we shall have paid $30,000 in taxes for a net result of zero after four years of labor. In Milwaukee no issue

has been raised against Socialism. At first "lower taxes" was the cry, but the fusion government was forced to raise taxes still higher, and little is now heard of that "issue." Appeals to race and religious prejudices are made. The bill-boards are covered with "American Flag vs. Red Flag" notices. Circulars are distributed asserting that Berger is against the Kaiser, hates the English, despises the French, loathes the Russians, abhors the Austrians, etc. The pious wish is expressed that he had gone to the European congress and had been shot. Vivid word pictures are drawn of his eternal damnation, and of worms devouring his "evil brain." Such is the stuff of which the opposition to Socialism is composed. Have the old parties nothing but this to offer? It would seem not in Butte, Schenectady, or Milwaukee. By what else can we judge them than their attitude in the districts where Socialism has succeeded?

In view of the facts, an intelligent voter cannot do better than cast his ballot for the Socialist Party. By so doing he will obtain a most efficient administration through the threat of a Socialist triumph; he will compel a significant political alignment, and, above all, he will force into the arena the nation's keenest minds to attack or defend the existing economic order. Surely slow and careful experimentation with real progress will follow such a course.

REVIEW OF BOOKS

SOCIALISM; PROMISE OR MENACE. By Morris Hillquit and John A. Ryan, D.D. New York: Macmillan. $1.25.

This debate between one of the ablest exponents of Socialism in America and a scholarly Roman Catholic divine is an interesting and important contribution to Socialist literature. Dr. Ryan proves to be exceptionally well informed in regard to Socialist theory and history and it is refreshing to find an anti-Socialist who does not attempt to set up a straw figure for demolition. It is not likely, however, that the arguments on either side will convert any reader to Socialism or induce any unregenerate Socialist to see the error of his ways, for it is obvious that the real difference between the authors is one of temperament and intellectual attitude more than in specific arguments.

In the introductory chapter the debaters agree that only the Socialism of the international movement is at issue. This excludes all the aberrant forms of Socialism and also any discussion of the Roman Catholic Church. In the chapter on Social Evils and Remedies, Dr. Ryan assumes at once the strongest anti-Socialist position, that of a reformer. He does not attempt to defend the capitalist order in its present form, and practically concedes the essential features of the Socialist indictment of capitalism. Mr. Hillquit is thus thrown completely on the defensive, which position he is obliged to maintain throughout the greater part of the debate. While admitting that the social order needs mending, Dr. Ryan believes that the Socialists exaggerate its evils, and that reforms are possible which will correct the shortcomings of capitalism without incurring the dangers which he believes to be inseparable from a revolutionary transformation. The Socialist Industrial State, as outlined by the leading Socialist writers and in Socialist programmes, Dr. Ryan be-

lieves would necessarily involve confiscation, which he rules out as immoral, and that if it could be attained that it would be impracticable and unworkable. In his reply in this chapter, Mr. Hillquit is at his best. In the following chapter the theories of the economic interpretation of history, the class struggle and surplus value form the basis of the argument. The theories are well stated, and Dr. Ryan presents a strong opposing argument.

The chapters on morality and religion reflect no great credit on either writer. To Ryan, religion and morality are inseparable from revelation and the authority of the Church. He cannot comprehend Hillquit's conception that these spiritual qualities have an economic basis and that they are subject to the laws of evolution. In his attempt to prove that Socialism is immoral and atheistic, Dr. Ryan falls back on the fallacy of selecting quotations from Socialist "authorities," and cannot be made to understand that Socialists do not recognize authorities in matters of theory. Mr. Hillquit also falls into a tactical error in making an attack on the historical church, in which field he finds his opponent fully prepared for him. While these chapters are interesting, it must be admitted that they are rather disappointing to a Socialist reader, who must feel that his champion either should have concealed his personal bias against the church, or that he should have admitted without apology that the Socialist viewpoint is intellectually incompatible with an adherence to a dogmatic religion. However this may be, no argument on this phase of Socialism could satisfy all Socialists, and perhaps Mr. Hillquit has done as well as any of his critics could do.

George Louis Arner, Ph.D.

A HISTORY OF SOCIALISM. By Thomas Kirkup. Fifth edition, revised and largely rewritten. By Edward R. Pease. N. Y.: Macmillan. $1.50.

To write a short history of a movement so extensive and intensive as Socialism is no slight undertaking. Mr. Kirkup did the job in 1892 with credit to himself and with profit to his readers. But Socialism is civilization in the making, and twenty odd years of its life have witnessed changes that no reliable history dare ignore. By judiciously pruning, revising and supplementing the earlier edition, therefore, Mr. Pease has done a necessary work and has made a good book better.

When deeds are narrated by a doer, the record gains in directness and credibility. Therein lies the special appeal of political narratives by statesmen and of military commentaries by generals who were principals first and historians second. Mr. Pease is a doer as well as a recorder. He doesn't emerge to his task from the depths of an ocean of books. He is, as American Socialists well know, a prominent member of the Fabian Society, he was the Society's Secretary for a quarter of a century, and since the inception of the Labor Party he has continuously been a member of the Party's Executive Committee. In view of the editor's modern, practical equipment, it is not surprising that the part of the book that deals with comparatively recent events is far and away the most readable and stimulating.

The first six or seven chapters suffer from a marked academicism of treatment. These are the chapters dealing with French, English, and German Socialism in the earlier half of the nineteenth century. Naturally, we expect them to furnish an account of the first experiments in collective living and thinking, an analysis of the failures and successes experimentally achieved, and a description of the sentiments, passions, aspirations, and self-help of the working people involved.

But our expectation is sadly defeated. What we actually find is a minute, fastidious interpretation of the theories of the leading Socialist pioneers, to wit, Owen, St. Simon, Fourier, Louis Blanc and Proudhon. These interpretations are always painstaking, but from the author's pains, the reader often gets nothing but anguish.

Thus, we hear an uncommon lot about Proudhon's tedious doctrine of *aubaine,* but only the baldest recital of facts about Owen's New Lanark community is vouchsafed us, while the New Harmony and Ralahine enterprises are barely mentioned. Again, we learn nothing about the industrial ramifications of the Chartist movement which is dismissed with a few words, but the fantastic sacerdotalism of St. Simon and the amoristic divagations of Enfantin are dwelt on at great length. And what do we find when we look for a history of Fourier's abortive *phalange* near Versailles, or of the Brook Farm experiment? Nothing at all. In default, we are treated to disquisitions on the altruism of Fourier's character and on the physiological psychology of his "Theory of the Human Passions." In short, primitive Socialist work and speculation are presented as a kind of symphonic concerto in which the man of genius plays the solo instrument in the center of the stage, while the common man occupies a back seat among the second fiddles.

But in the second part of the book, the part that expressly represents Mr. Pease's labors, these faults are quite atoned for. The common man comes into his birthright, the center of interest being shifted from the virtues and frailties of leaders to the concerted activities of working and thinking men. This is what we want. For a scientific history of Socialism can no more retire the ordinary majority into a vague background to heighten the romantic figures of great men, than a scientific history of nations can subordinate the play of economic forces to the tinsel diplomatic intrigues of princes, potentates, or powers.

From a really fascinating account of the revolution in Russia, Mr. Pease turns to the evolutionary record of contemporary Socialism in the several countries of Europe, to a very temperate exposition of Anarchist, Syndicalist, and I. W. W. doctrines, and to an intimate and graphic story of Socialist thought and enterprise in Great Britain. His modest apology for the space devoted to Fabian undertakings is hardly necessary, inasmuch as the Fabian Society is not merely the first of the coming Life-Research Universities, but being still the only one in the field, it is Socialism's Harvard, Cambridge, Heidelberg, and Sorbonne rolled into one. This fact is not yet fully understood in America where we find any number of people clever enough to sneer at the Fabians, yet not clever enough to supersede them by contriving wiser plans and conducting abler researches.

Mr. Pease points out with unconcealed satisfaction that the Revisionists or State Socialists are gaining ground on every hand. Compromise is the medium of political action as much as the air is the medium of a Zeppelin. A party that enters the cockpit of politics and then refuses to play the game is bound to cut a singularly absurd figure. It is like donning a bathing suit in order to take a walk along the beach, or getting into football togs in order to sit in the bleachers and howl at the umpire. The editor cites a number of instances in which even the rigidly orthodox German Social Democracy has made common-sense compromises with a capitalist faction. These instances are now dwarfed by the events of the present war during which the European Socialist organizations have given an amazing exhibition of the universal surrender of strict Marxian aloofness. The irreconcilable Guesde

affiliates with Poincaré's government, the Internationalist Vandervelde with the Belgian ministry, the British Socialist (Marxian) Party drums up recruits for the Court of St. James. Let us hope that the sacrifices the intransigents are making in the interests of a stupid war will be made hereafter in the higher interests of peace.

In the American section, Mr. Pease reproaches us with borrowing our Socialism from England and Germany instead of manufacturing it on the soil. As he has recently modified this charge, (which, until quite lately, was a just one), we need not dwell on the zeal with which the party is Americanizing itself. We cannot let the opportunity pass, however, without remarking that if the native products of American Socialism are not immediately visible under its own party standard, they may be traced, as large as life and almost as natural, in the form and substance of the Progressive Party.

On the whole, the new edition of Kirkup is the best book of its class with which I am familiar. To the scientific mind it will prove acceptable by the logic of its arrangement, the accuracy of its presentation, and the compactness of its material; to the literary mind it will appeal by the grace and straightforwardness of Mr. Pease's style.

Felix Grendon, Ph.D.

SUNLIGHT AND SHADOW. By Louise W. Kneeland. Boston: Sherman, French & Co. 1914.

Herein is a group of poems in tender, passionate strain, poems of nature, of love, many of them bearing a pure lyrical quality, even at times a note of the old Elizabethan lilt, as in "Sing, Little Heart, Sing," and "As Its Scent to the Heart of the Rose." One cannot but wish that the author had freed herself from much old-time diction of "rills" and "raiment," "rippling brooks" and "woodland shades," as well as from merely traditional melancholy of thought as in "I Buried My Love." All too seldom are discovered verses which reveal the great cause of the disinherited, so dear we know to this author's heart, but here and there one is found as in the rebellious "The Oath" or the stirring "The Soul's Reveille." C. L.

IN THE COLLEGES.

That the Society's opportunities for usefulness in the colleges of the country are ever increasing is evidenced by the November trip of Harry W. Laidler, organizing secretary of the I. S. S. Mr. Laidler left New York on November 3rd and was present at the organization of a strong Alumni Chapter in Wilkes-Barre on that evening. On Wednesday and Thursday he spoke before four economics classes at Cornell University on "The Principles of Socialism," and addressed a meeting Wednesday evening in Goldwin-Smith Hall on "Socialism and the War." Friday morning Mr. Laidler lectured on the war before three of the economics and sociology classes of the University of Rochester. On Monday, November 9th, he spoke at the "Money and Banking" class of Syracuse University and on November 10th addressed two history classes at Colgate. At the latter university he spent three hours coaching the debating squad which is scheduled to debate on Socialism with Ohio Wesleyan, Rochester and other universities.

On Wednesday evening the organizing secretary addressed a large meeting of the Hamilton College Y. M. C. A. on "Christianity and Socialism." The next day a study group, with one dozen members, was formed at that college. Evan E. Jones was elected chairman. The members of the group are among the most representative students in college. At Union College Mr. Laidler spoke Friday morning before two more economics classes and endeavored, Saturday and Sunday, to interest some of the alumni in the organization of an I. S. S. Chapter at Schenectady. Monday, November 16th, found Mr. Laidler in Williams College, where he dealt with the "Ideals and Achievements of Modern Socialism." Williams is just now interested in the question of the public ownership of the telephones and telegraphs, as that is the question of the triangular debate with Amherst and Wesleyan. Bruce M. Smith, president of the Williams Chapter, presided at the meeting here.

The following evening Mr. Laidler lectured before 150 students at the weekly discussion meeting on the European War, held in the chapel of the Massachusetts Agricultural College. On Wednesday, November 18th, he spoke before an economics class at Springfield Y. M. C. A. College, followed by a talk before the entire student body in college chapel. The same afternoon he visited Amherst College and addressed a meeting under the auspices of the Amherst Forum. Following the meeting a Chapter at Amherst was formed, with Walter R. Agard, president of the Forum, Hilmar Rauschenbusch and others as moving spirits. That evening the Chapter of the M. A. C. was re-organized and the next morning a short talk was given before the joint logic and economics classes at Amherst, followed by questions from the members of the classes.

Thursday evening Mr. Laidler spoke at the meeting of the Springfield Alumni Chapter of the I. S. S. in the Art Museum, Springfield; Friday, at the dinner of the New England Committee of the I. S. S.; Saturday, before the Fabian Club; Sunday, at the conference of the Brooklyn Trinity Church, and Monday, before the labor problems class at Yale University.

During his trip, Mr. Laidler was present at some 32 meetings attended by 1,500 college students and 700 college alumni and non-collegians. Seventeen of his addresses were given before economics, history, and sociology classes. Keen interest in Socialism was manifested in practically every educational center visited.

NEW ENGLAND STATES

The NEW ENGLAND COMMITTEE of the I. S. S., Ordway Tead, Amherst, 1912, chairman, Walter M. Hinkle, Williams, 1914, organizer, is doing more active work than ever before in organizing and strengthening undergraduate chapters in that section. On Friday evening, November 20th, the Committee held its sectional dinner in Boston. A large number of students were present from the colleges in and around Boston. The subject, "Modern Socialism," was discussed by Prof. Ellen Hayes, John S. Kennedy, Harry W. Laidler, and Franklin H. Wentworth, chairman. Ethel M. Thornbury said a few words concerning the progress at Wellesley, Dorothea U. Whitney represented Radcliffe and Mr. Harrison, Harvard. Among those who took part in the discussion were Prof. Emily J. Balch, Ordway Tead, Mary Wood Daley, Walter Hinkle, Louise Grout.

William English Wailing lectured in early December before the students at Harvard, Brown, Radcliffe, Wellesley, Simmons, and other colleges.

Harry W. Laidler spoke at several of the New England colleges during November and is scheduled for Clark, Bowdoin, Bates, Colby, and the University of Maine, during the first part of December. George R. Lunn will lecture before several of the New England colleges in February and Ordway Tead and Walter Hinkle will tour the colleges in the first part of the year.

Among the speakers before the YALE Chapter this year are Algernon Lee, Robert Hunter, Jessie W. Hughan, Meyer London, Morris Hillquit, President Hadley, William English Walling and others. The Yale Chapter is planning a series of study meetings as well as the public lectures. Their membership is constantly increasing. T. M. Duncan, the secretary, and other members will represent the Yale group at the I. S. S. Convention. Alexander Trachtenberg has been nominated student representative.

The RADCLIFFE Chapter has arranged meetings for William English Walling and Juliet S. Poyntz. Prof. Vida D. Scudder and Bouck White are among other speakers scheduled. Miss Dorothea U. Whitney is president and Ruth E. Fletcher, secretary. Miss Whitney will represent the Radcliffe Chapter at the I. S. S. Convention. The SPRINGFIELD Y. M. C. A. Chapter was reorganized this Fall at a meeting addressed by Professor Burr of the Economics Department. James Bain is president and Edgar P. Hillier, secretary. Mr. Roberts of Springfield, recent candidate for governor, addressed a meeting in the latter part of November. The HARVARD Chapter is planning meetings for William English Walling, John Haynes Holmes and other speakers. R. W. Chubb has been re-elected president. There is excellent material in Harvard for a strong organization.

The WESLEYAN Chapter I. S. S. listened to a talk by Dr. Edward N. Clopper on "Child Labor" on November 5th. The Chapter is planning to hold several meetings on important problems of social reform. Mr. Laidler will speak before the CONNECTICUT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE Chapter on Friday, December 4th. The Chapters at AMHERST, WILLIAMS, MASS. AGR. COLLEGE, CLARK, and SIMMONS are planning active seasons. The group of the AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE is meeting with the SPRINGFIELD ALUMNI Chapter of the I. S. S.

An informal study club has been organized in WELLESLEY with a membership of 81. Miss Ethel M. Thornbury is leader of the group.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES

The COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY Chapter is doing excellent educational work this year. Algernon Lee, William English Walling, Jessie W. Hughan and others have addressed the Chap-

ter on various phases of the Socialist philosophy. A strong group has been formed this Fall at C. C. N. Y., with Bernhard H. King as president and L. Solomon secretary. Harry W. Laidler addressed a large meeting on "Socialism and the War" in November and Paul Kennaday and others are being scheduled for later in the year. The CORNELL Chapter I. S. S. is planning an interesting program. Professor V. Karapetoff, Harry W. Laidler, Professor Burr, Professor Schmidt and others have been secured as speakers. Gustave Gerber is president.

The HAMILTON COLLEGE Chapter organized in November and promises good work during the season. Among the members are Evan E. Jones, D. B. Kimball, president of the Y. M. C. A.; F. R. McNair, editor of the college paper; J. L. Keddy, and others. A group was formed in the NEW YORK UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF COMMERCE, largely through the efforts of Bernard R. Rachmel and I. N. Goodman. Mr. Laidler and Dr. Rubinow have been scheduled to address this Chapter. At PRINCETON the organizing secretary will probably speak the latter part of December or the first part of January. A movement is on foot for the formation of Chapters at the UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA and other colleges. A strong organization has just been formed at the UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, with A. Epstein as president. Morris Zucker of the NEW YORK COLLEGE OF DENTISTRY reports a very strong sentiment toward Socialism in that college. Mr. Laidler spoke at Poughkeepsie on December 1st in Germania Hall before the towns-people and some of the students of Vassar.

MIDDLE WEST

Frank Bohn, Ph.D., addressed in December enthusiastic gatherings at the UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI and at OHIO WESLEYAN. Alfred G. Wheeler is the president and Dora Miller the secretary of the University of Cincinnati group. E. R. Burton is secretary of the Ohio Wesleyan Chapter, re-organized by Dr. Bohn. Both groups are most promising. Dr. Bohn also spoke before the debating squad at Ohio Wesleyan. The debating team is taking up the subject of Socialism with five other universities.

Irwin Tucker, B.D., managing editor of *The Christian Socialist,* is available for lectures this year in the Middle West and in the Eastern States. He can be reached c/o The Christian Socialist, 5457 Drexel Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and is an excellent speaker.

The HAMLINE UNIVERSITY Chapter reports fine prospects during the year. Professor Thomas P. Beyer, an endorser of the Society, is advising the Chapter in its study work. The I. S. S. Chapter at the UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN is more vigorous than for some years past, and the secretary, Miss I. Edith Sapira, reports good prospects. Ammon A. Hennacy is among the active spirits. Several students at VALPARAISO are putting new life into the I. S. S. Chapter at that university.

Word of possible organization has been received from the University of MEXICO, RICE Institute and other universities.

PACIFIC COAST

"We have had three very enthusiastic meetings and have bright prospects for future work," writes Edward Goldberg of LELAND STANFORD UNIVERSITY. The interest of the women students is especially marked.

The Social Democratic Club of the UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON has been re-organized, with A. Rickles as secretary.

SOUTH

J. C. Duke of RICHMOND COLLEGE writes: "I believe I will be able to resurrect the Richmond Chapter. There are several students who are interested."

ALUMNI CHAPTERS

A group of fourteen formed an Alumni Chapter at WILKES-BARRE, Penn., on November 5th. Harriet L. Jones is chairman. The BUFFALO ALUMNI Chapter reports good meetings by John Spargo on "The Moral Obligations to Investigate Socialism"; Charles Rann Kennedy on "English Fabianism"; Max Eastman on "War and Nationalism"; Frank Bohn, Ph.D., and others. Mrs. Nina Bull reports "33 members and lots of enthusiasm." The December meetings of the NEW YORK ALUMNI Chapter are—Thursday, December 3rd, at Miss Stokes' Studio, 90 Grove St., N. Y. C.; chairman, Paul Douglas; speaker, Dr. I. M. Rubinow; subject: "Social Insurance and Labor Legislation"; Thursday, December 17th, at St. Mark's Chapel, 234 E. 11th St.; chairman, Harry W. Laidler; speaker, N. I. Stone; subject: "Trade Unions and Wages, Hours, etc." The three scholarly lectures by Morris Hillquit on "Socialism and the War" in Cooper Union, New York, were keenly enjoyed by many members and friends of the Society.

The SPRINGFIELD ALUMNI Chapter is holding its regular study meetings this Fall. Harry W. Laidler addressed the Chapter in November. The FRESNO Chapter is planning a fine season of activity.

The statement below, made in March, 1914, was omitted through a mistake from the October-November issue of the magazine, and in its place was printed the statement sent to the post office department on October, 1914:

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., OF THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST, published bi-monthly, excepting June, July, August, September, at New York, N. Y., required by the Act of August 24, 1912. Editor, Harry W. Laidler, 105 W. 40th St., New York City. Managing Editor, Harry W. Laidler, 105 W. 40th St., New York City. Business Manager, Alice Kuebler, 105 W. 40th St., New York City. Publisher, Intercollegiate Socialist Society, 105 W. 40th St., New York City. Owners: Intercollegiate Socialist Society.

There are no known bondholders, mortgagees or other security holders.

Harry W. Laidler, Editor.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 31st day of March, 1914.

Chas. Edgar, Notary Public, No. 960, New York County, Register's Office No. 5024.

(My Commission expires March 30, 1915.)

Modern Industry

In Relation to the Family, Health, Education, Morality

By **Florence Kelley,** General Secretary, National Consumers' League; formerly Chief State Factory Inspector of Illinois. Crown 8vo. $1.00 *net.*

The reader will find in the small compass of "Modern Industry" a body of sound concrete facts, keen reflection upon the changes that the profit-seeking capitalistic system has brought into human society, and wise comment upon the forces that are already at work and that may be initiated to provide the conditions necessary to a higher and finer civilization."—EMILIE J. HUTCHINSON in *The Intercollegiate Socialist.*

Longmans, Green, & Co.
4th Ave. & 30th St., New York

To Thoroly Understand

the controversy between the "reds" and the "yellows' which has caused a loss in membership in the Socialist Party, every Socialist should read

KARL KAUTSKY'S

THE ROAD TO POWER

CONTENTS:

1—The Conquest of Political Power.
2—Prophecies of the Revolution.
3—Growing Gradually into the Cooperative Commonwealth.
4—Economic Evolution and the Will.
5—Neither Revolution nor Legality "at any price."
6—The Growth of Revolutionary Elements.
7—The Softening of Class Antagonisms.
8—The Sharpening of Class Antagonisms.
9—A New Period of Revolution.

You will agree with other students of Socialism and its critics that this is the greatest book since "The Communist Manifesto" was written.

CLOTH 50c. PAPER 25c.

Order your Copy TODAY.

THE EDUCATIONAL PRESS Inc.
831 McClurg Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

We can supply you with any book of any publishers

THE CURRENT UNREST

Is Diagnosed By

WALTER LIPPMANN

In His New Book

"DRIFT AND MASTERY"

This is a book at once comprehensive, shrewd, vigorous, searching, and interesting—with always a saving sense of humor. In the course of 16 chapters Mr. Lippmann discusses practically all the more important problems of our political, social, and economic life, and the factors that have brought about that curious unrest everywhere so noticeable.

CONTENTS

Introduction
The Themes of Muckraking
New Incentives
The Magic of Property
Caveat Emptor
A Key to the Labor Movement
The Funds of Progress
"A Nation of Villagers"
A Big World and Little Men
Drift
The Rock of Ages
A Note on The Woman's Movement
Bogeys
Poverty, Chastity, Obedience
Mastery
Modern Communism
Fact and Fancy

Cloth Binding *360 Pages* *$1.50 net*

At All Book Shops

MITCHELL KENNERLEY
PUBLISHER **NEW YORK**

FREE!

A copy of the "Socialist War Manual," the most adequate interpretation of the War, FREE with one year's subscription to the NEW REVIEW.

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

An Indispensable Socialist Magazine

More and more the progressive radical recognizes the indispensable character of the **New Review.**

Our November and December issue contains articles by Prof. JACQUES LOEB, CHARLES P. STEINMETZ, ANTON PANNEKOEK, JOHN MOODY, MAX EASTMAN, WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING, FRANK BOHN and others.

Our "Socialist Digest" department contains a brilliant monthly summary and interpretation of the world's most radical thought.

One Dollar the year

NEW REVIEW

87 GREENWICH AVENUE

NEW YORK CITY

Price-List of I. S. S. Publications — Invaluable to Students of Socialism

To Skeptics and Doubters *by W. J. Ghent* ..... 1 for 5c.	5 for 20c.	10 for 40c.
32 pp. pamphlet giving an analysis of Socialism in Mr. Ghent's brilliant and appealing style	25 for $1.00 (11c. ex. post.)	50 for $1.90 (3c. ex. post.) (13c. ex. post.)	100 for $3.75 (6c. ex. post.) (25c. ex. post.)
What Socialists Stand For ..... 2 for 1c.	25 for 10c.	50 for 20c.	100 for 35c.
1 page leaflet			
Socialism and the Student ..... 1 for 1c.	12 for 10c.	50 for 35c.
2 pp. leaflet giving reasons why students should be interested in Socialism			
Books on Socialism ..... 3 for 10c.	10 for 25c.	25 for 50c.
12 pp. pamphlet classifying important Socialist books			
Study Courses ..... 1 for 3c.	10 for 25c.	25 for 50c.
16 pp. pamphlet giving 4 suggested study courses in Socialism			
Study Chapters ..... 1 for 2c.	15 for 25c.	
8 pp. pamphlet giving methods of organizing and conducting study groups			
Annual Statement ..... 1 for 2c.	15 for 25c.	25 for 40c.
20 pp. pamphlet giving object of Society and summary of activity			

One of each of the above mailed to your address for 10c. — I. S. S., 41 Union Sq. W., N. Y. City